



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/723,591	11/28/2000	Robert P. Macaulay	NORC0008US(13469ROUS01U)	8528

7590 10/28/2005

Dan C. Hu
Trop Pruner & Hu
8554 Katy Freeway Ste 100
Houston, TX 77024

EXAMINER

SCHEIBEL, ROBERT C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2666

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/723,591

Applicant(s)

MACAULAY ET AL.

Examiner

Robert C. Scheibel

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-35, 37-40 and 43-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-35, 37-40 and 43-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 8/18/2005 is acknowledged.
- Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-12, 37, and 43 are amended in this amendment.
- Claims 15, 24, 32, 36, and 41-42 have been cancelled.
- Claims 45-48 have been newly added.
- Claims 1-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-35, 37-40, and 43-48 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 45 and 46, see page 9, filed 8/18/2005, have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The new grounds of rejection are necessitated by the amendments to the claim.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 3, see the first three paragraphs of page 10, filed 8/18/2005, have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The new grounds of rejection are necessitated by the amendments to the claim.
3. Applicant's arguments, see paragraphs 4 and 5 of page 10, filed 8/18/2005, with respect to the rejections of claims 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that there is no support for the statement that the computer can run one or more of these modules. Applicant further argues that Alexander is silent on this limitation and the limitation that these modules are clones of other terminals. However, Alexander does a client module acting as a clone of another terminal. While the terminology is different, Alexander's alternate device terminal clearly anticipates the alternate devices acting as the original device (and thus as a clone of the other device). One example (cited in the previous

Art Unit: 2666

action) which matches to the applicant's replicate cloning is the case when the ring delay time in the alternate device table is zero, thus causing both devices (the original and the clone) to be rung simultaneously. Further, Alexander discloses one embodiment of the IP telephony device as being a computer running Microsoft software. It is well known in the art that multiple instances of a given application can be and often are created on a single computer (for example, most users of Microsoft software have created multiple instances of a browser at some time.) Since it is clear that one instance of this software is a clone of another telephony device, it is equally clear that multiple instances would each be clones of other telephony devices. The previous rejection is therefore maintained below.

4. Applicant's arguments, see pages 10-11, filed 8/18/2005, with respect to the rejections of claims 16-22 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the AAPA does not suggest associating a first logical port between a telephony proxy server and a switch module with both the first and second terminals. Applicant further argues that there is no suggestion of forwarding the call request through the first logical port. Applicant further contends that the office action engages in impermissible hindsight. However, examiner respectfully disagrees. Alexander discloses every limitation of claim 16 with the exception of the applicant's particular choice in implementing the association between the terminals and the means by which the call manager is implemented in a distributed manner. The previous office action relies on AAPA merely for its teaching of the conventional use of logical ports in switching systems. Further, Alexander does suggest implementing the call manager in a distributed manner (as indicated in the previous office action) and it would have

Art Unit: 2666

been obvious to apply the conventional use of logical ports in order to implement this change.

The previous rejection is thus maintained below.

5. Applicant's arguments, see pages 11-12, filed 8/18/2005, with respect to the rejection of claims 23-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant references the previous discussion on the combination of Alexander and AAPA as the basis for his argument against the current rejection of claim 23. For the reasons stated above, the previous rejection is maintained below. Applicant further argues at the top of page 12 that

O'Neal does not teach updating a *table* to indicate which terminal answered the request.

However, the rejection of the previous office action is using the teaching of O'Neal regarding storing the last terminal to answer and dialing that number first to Alexander. Since Alexander uses a table (alternate device table), it is clear that the combination of Alexander, AAPA, and O'Neal will also use this table. Furthermore, since O'Neal supports more than one subscriber, it is also clear that some sort of table (in a broad sense of the term) is required to store this information with each entry in the table corresponding to a subscriber. For at least these reasons, the previous rejection is maintained below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims **1-6, 8-13, 43, 46, and 48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,775,369 to McClung.

Regarding claim 1, McClung discloses a method of controlling communications in a network, comprising: receiving a request to clone a first terminal with a second terminal (defining a roaming line in lines 7-15 of column 9; the roaming line in the clone; see lines 41-47 of column 6 for more explanation of the roaming line); in response to the request to clone, associating a logical identifier of the first terminal with the second terminal (lines 9-12 of column 9); receiving a call request specifying the logical identifier of the first terminal (the call initiation request in lines 26-30 of column 9); in response to the call request, sending an alert indication to the second terminal (see lines 43-45 of column 9); receiving a second indication from the second terminal for initiating a call session with a third terminal (the off-hook indication implied in lines 55-60 of column 9); in response to the second indication (the off-hook indication), accessing profile information (the mapping table 110) associated with the first terminal (the entry associated with the first terminal 1002) to process the second indication for establishing the call session between the second terminal and the third terminal (it is explicitly indicated in lines 37-42 of column 9 that the profile information associated with the first terminal (the mapping table) is accessed in order to find the addresses of the terminals in order to notify these devices of the incoming call; it is thus clear that the call manager will access the same profile information (the mapping table) in order to obtain the addresses of the devices to notify them to stop ringing (see lines 59-60 of column 9)).

Similarly, regarding claim 3, McClung discloses a method of controlling communications in a network, comprising: receiving a request to clone a first terminal with a second terminal

Art Unit: 2666

(defining a roaming line in lines 7-15 of column 9; the roaming line in the clone; see lines 41-47 of column 6 for more explanation of the roaming line); in response to the request to clone, associating a logical identifier of the first terminal with the second terminal (lines 9-12 of column 9); wherein associating the logical identifier comprises storing a table associating the logical identifier with identifiers of the first and second terminals (the mapping table of figure 3); receiving a call request from the second terminal to initiate a call session with a third terminal (the call initiation request in lines 26-30 of column 9); and in response to the call request, accessing profile information of the first terminal to establish the call session between the second terminal and third terminal (it is explicitly indicated in lines 37-42 of column 9 that the profile information associated with the first terminal (the mapping table) is accessed in order to find the addresses of the terminals in order to notify these devices of the incoming call; it is thus clear that the call manager will access the same profile information (the mapping table) in order to obtain the addresses of the devices to notify them to stop ringing (see lines 59-60 of column 9)).

Regarding claim 2, McClung discloses the limitation that associating the logical identifier of the first terminal with the second terminal comprises associating a directory number of the first terminal with the second terminal (the mapping table of figure 3 maps the directory number of the first terminal with the second terminal; lines 32-37 of column 6 explain how this can be more than a 4-digit number).

Regarding claim 4, McClung discloses the limitation that storing the table comprises storing a table associating the logical identifier with Internet Protocol addresses of the first and second terminals (see figure 3).

Regarding claim **5**, McClung discloses the limitation of receiving at least another request to clone the first terminal with at least another terminal in lines 42-47 of column 6 which indicates that one or more telephony devices can be cloned (or designated as roaming lines).

Regarding claim **6**, McClung discloses the limitation that receiving the request comprises receiving a request at a terminal proxy server in that the call manager 26 is the terminal proxy server.

Regarding claims **8 and 9**, McClung discloses the limitation that the request to clone comprises a request to override the first terminal with the second terminal and that the alert is not sent to the overridden terminal in lines 44-45 of column 6 which indicate that the roaming line can be used *instead of* the user's regularly scheduled telephony device.

Regarding claims **10 and 11**, McClung discloses the limitation that the request to clone comprises a request to replicate the first terminal with the second terminal and that another alert is sent to the first terminal in lines 44-45 of column 6 which indicate that the roaming line can be used *in addition to* the user's regularly scheduled telephony device. See also lines 43-45 of column 9.

Regarding claim **12**, McClung discloses the limitation of receiving an answer indication from one of the first and second terminals in response to the alerts is disclosed in the off-hook indications discussed in lines 52-60 of column 9.

Regarding claim **13**, McClung discloses the limitation of establishing a call session between another terminal that sent the call request and one of the first terminal and second terminal in lines 60-63 of column 9.

Regarding claim **43**, McClung discloses the limitation that storing the table associating the first logical identifier with identifiers of the first and second terminals comprises storing the table associating the first logical identifier with both the identifier of the first terminal and the identifier of the second terminal in the mapping table of figure 3; see the row for device 1002 for example.

Regarding claim **46**, McClung discloses the limitation of receiving a call request from a fourth terminal throughout. It is clear that there is no requirement for a single originating telephony device, so the call request can clearly come from a third or fourth terminal.

Regarding claim **48**, McClung discloses the limitation of receiving a second call request from a fourth terminal specifying the logical identifier of the first terminal throughout; it is clear that there is no requirement for a single originating telephony device, so the call request can clearly come from a third or fourth terminal. Further, McClung discloses the limitation of sending an alert indication to the second terminal in response to the second call request in lines 43-45 of column 9.

3. Claims **3-4, 37-40 and 43** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,798,767 to Alexander et al.

Regarding claim **37**, Alexander discloses the control unit in the IP telephony devices 24 or 42 of Figure 1. The passage from lines 1-8 of column 4 discloses client modules (telephony software) executable on the control unit. Clearly, the computer can run one or more of these modules. The passage in lines 55-65 of column 12 discloses the limitation of sending a request to a server (call manager 26a or 26b of figure 1) to select a terminal to clone, wherein the soft

Art Unit: 2666

clients become clones of respective terminals. The updating of the alternate number list anticipates the limitation of requesting a server to clone; as disclosed throughout, devices with a ring delay time of zero in the alternate device table of Figure 3 are rung simultaneously with the target device (and each other) and are thus clones of each other – see lines 3-4 of column 8 for example.

Regarding claim 38, the limitation that the soft client module is adapted to receive an alert indication from the server corresponding to a call request received by the server for the terminal the soft client module is cloning (disclosed throughout where the simultaneous ringing of the target device and alternate devices with a zero ring delay time is described – lines 3-4 of column 8 for example).

Regarding claims 39 and 40, the LAN and WAN clouds of Figure 1 clearly comprise routers which route packets to and from the soft client modules, thus selecting one of the soft client modules for communicating packets in a call session. The limitation that an additional code in each packet is used to select one of the soft client modules is inherent in the fact that this is commonly done in IP networks using the port number or some other field to indicate the particular application within one device to which a particular packet is destined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2666

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,775,369 to McClung in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

McClung discloses all the limitations of parent claim 6 as discussed in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) above.

McClung does not disclose expressly of the terminal proxy server communicating with the switch module via logical ports and associating a logical port with the first and second terminals.

AAPA discloses the use of logical ports between a TPS and a switch as used in IP telephony in lines 18-25 of page 2 of the present application. The AAPA clearly discloses reserving a logical port for the telephony client and then routing call control signaling messages through this logical port. McClung and AAPA are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of IP telephony. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement McClung using a TPS and a switch instead of a

Art Unit: 2666

single call manager. Clearly, this would result in associating the first and second terminals with a logical port and then forwarding the call control messages using this logical port. The motivation for doing so would have been implement the system in a distributed manner. This distributed implementation would clearly make the system less expensive to implement by reusing the common functionality of existing devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine AAPA with Alexander for the benefit of a distributed implementation to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

7. Claim **14** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,775,369 to McClung in view of U.S. Patent 6,798,767 to Alexander et al.

McClung discloses all the limitations of parent claim **10** as discussed in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) above.

McClung does not disclose expressly of multicasting the alert to the first and second terminals. Alexander discloses this limitation throughout, see lines 17-24 of column 2, for example; since the devices are rung simultaneously, the alerts are essentially multicast to these devices. McClung and Alexander are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of telephony using data networks. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify McClung to simultaneously ring multiple devices simultaneously. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow subscribers to be more accessible. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Alexander with McClung for the benefit of greater subscriber accessibility to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

8. Claims **16-22 and 44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,798,767 to Alexander et al in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Regarding claim **16**, Alexander discloses the limitation of receiving a request to establish a first terminal as a clone of a second terminal (devices with a ring delay time of zero in the alternate device table of Figure 3 are rung simultaneously with the target device (and each other) as described throughout – see lines 3-4 of column 8 for example; lines 1-8 of column 4 clearly establish computer 24 as an IP telephony device; lines 55-65 clearly indicate that at least an IP telephony device which is a computer (like element 24 of figure 1) can access and modify the alternate number list, this modification anticipating the request to clone the terminals).

Alexander also discloses creating an association between the two terminals in response to the request in the updated alternate number list. The limitation of receiving at the switch module a call request specifying the second terminal as the target is disclosed in element 202 of Figure 5A for example. The limitation of routing the call request to the first terminal is disclosed in element 222 of Figure 5A, for example.

Alexander does not disclose expressly the limitation that the association created in response to the request is a logical port between the TPS and the switch module. Similarly, Alexander does not disclose the limitation of forwarding the call request through the first logical port.

AAPA discloses the use of logical ports between a TPS and a switch as used in IP telephony in lines 18-25 of page 2 of the present application. The AAPA clearly discloses reserving a logical port for the telephony client and then routing call control signaling messages

Art Unit: 2666

through this logical port. Alexander and AAPA are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of IP telephony. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Alexander using a TPS and a switch instead of a single call manager. Clearly, this would result in associating the first and second terminals with a logical port and then forwarding the call control messages using this logical port. The motivation for doing so would have been to implement the call manager in a distributed manner as suggested by Alexander in lines 19-21 of column 7. This distributed implementation would clearly make the call manager less expensive to implement by reusing the common functionality of existing devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine AAPA with Alexander for the benefit of a distributed implementation to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Regarding claim 17, Alexander discloses the limitation of disabling the second terminal in lines 55-65 of column 12; the terminal can be disabled by modifying the alternate number list to remove the terminal from the list.

Regarding claim 18, Alexander discloses the limitation of setting the first terminal as a replicate of the second terminal in the description above where both terminals are alerted.

Regarding claim 19, Alexander discloses the limitation of routing the call request to the second terminal in the case where both terminals are alerted (zero ring delay).

Regarding claim 20, Alexander discloses the limitation of receiving an indication from one of the terminals that the call request has been answered in lines 59-61 of column 11.

Regarding claim 21, Alexander discloses the limitation of establishing a call session between the terminal that transmitted the request and the first of second terminal in lines 35-36 of column 12.

Regarding claim **22**, Alexander discloses the limitation that the call request is received over a packet-based network in the LANs 20a and 20b of Figure 1.

Regarding claim **44**, the limitation that forwarding the call request over the first logical port is performed instead of forwarding the call request over a second logical port from the switch module to the telephony proxy server, the second logical port previously associated with the first terminal prior to the request to establish the first terminal as a clone of the second terminal is clearly disclosed by the combination of Alexander and AAPA discussed above. As established above, the combination associates the two terminals with the first logical port and thus the call request will be forwarded over this logical port when received.

9. Claims **23, 25-31 and 33-35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,798,767 to Alexander et al in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,263,064 to O'Neal et al.

Regarding claim **23**, Alexander discloses the limitation of an interface coupled to at least a first and a second terminal in the LAN 20a which is coupled to terminals (IP telephony devices 22-24 of Figure 1). There are clearly many other examples of this interface throughout Alexander as well. Alexander discloses the limitation of the control module in the call manager (26a or 26b of Figure 1). Alexander also discloses the limitation that this control module, in response to a request from a first terminal, defines the first terminal as a clone of a second terminal (devices with a ring delay time of zero in the alternate device table of Figure 3 are rung simultaneously with the target device (and each other) as described throughout – see lines 3-4 of column 8 for example; lines 1-8 of column 4 clearly establish computer 24 as an IP telephony

Art Unit: 2666

device; lines 55-65 clearly indicate that at least an IP telephony device which is a computer (like element 24 of figure 1) can access and modify the alternate number list, which is the clone request). Alexander discloses storing an association between the first and second terminals in the alternate number table of Figure 3. Alexander discloses the limitation receiving a call request containing a first logical identifier associated with the first and second terminals in element 202 of Figure 5A. The limitation of alerting both terminals in response to the request is disclosed in elements 208 and 222 of Figure 5A.

Alexander does not disclose expressly the limitation that the association created in response to the request is a logical port between the TPS and the switch module. Similarly, Alexander does not disclose expressly the limitation of updating the table to indicate that the terminal that answered the call is the one to which forwarded future call requests should be forwarded.

AAPA discloses the use of logical ports between a TPS and a switch as used in IP telephony in lines 18-25 of page 2 of the present application. The AAPA clearly discloses reserving a logical port for the telephony client and then routing call control signaling messages through this logical port. Alexander and AAPA are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of IP telephony. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement Alexander using a TPS and a switch instead of a single call manager. Clearly, this would result in associating the first and second terminals with a logical port and then forwarding the call control messages using this logical port. The motivation for doing so would have been to implement the call manager in a distributed manner as suggested by Alexander in lines 19-21 of column 7. This distributed implementation would

Art Unit: 2666

clearly make the call manager less expensive to implement by reusing the common functionality of existing devices.

The combination of Alexander and AAPA does not disclose expressly the limitation of updating the table to indicate that the terminal that answered the call is the one to which forwarded future call requests should be forwarded.

O'Neal discloses the limitation of updating the table to indicate that the terminal that answered the call is the one to which forwarded future call requests should be forwarded in lines 54-57 of column 12. Alexander, as modified, and O'Neal are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of telephony using a data network. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Alexander to update the alternate number table to select the last terminal to answer as the first terminal to be alerted in response to the next call request. The motivation for doing so would have been to more intelligently route the call based on information regarding the called parties location. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine O'Neal with Alexander, modified, for the benefit of more intelligent routing to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

Regarding claim **25**, Alexander discloses the limitation that the first logical identifier is a directory number in step 202 of Figure 5A – see lines 33-42 of column 10 as well.

Regarding claim **26**, the combination of Alexander and AAPA discussed above clearly also comprises a switch module (the switch to which the logical ports are used to communicate call signaling messages.)

Regarding claim **27**, the combination of Alexander and AAPA discussed above clearly also discloses receiving at the control module a request from the first terminal and the switch

Art Unit: 2666

module treating the request as a request from the second terminal since the two terminals are associated with the same logical port number.

Regarding claims **28 and 29**, the combination of Alexander and AAPA discussed above clearly also discloses the limitation of the control module selecting among a plurality of logical ports; the switch module would not be of much use if only one logical port was supported and the control module must clearly select the appropriate logical port on which to send the control messages for a particular session. Since the first two terminals are associated with the same logical port, it is clear that a request for the first terminal will use a logical port that is also used for the second terminal.

Regarding claim **30**, the combination of Alexander and AAPA discussed above clearly also discloses the limitation that the control module comprises a terminal proxy server (see lines 20-22 of page 2 of the present application.)

Regarding claim **31**, Alexander discloses the limitation of the storage unit containing information associating a directory number with the first and second terminals in Figure 3. This table associates the directory number of the target number with the target device and the alternate device(s).

Regarding claim **33**, Alexander discloses the limitation that the first terminal is set as a replicate of the second terminal in the alternate devices with zero ring delay which will cause these devices to be rung simultaneously with the target device.

Regarding claim **34**, Alexander discloses the limitation of the interface comprising an interface to an IP network in the LANs 20a and 20b of Figure 1.

Regarding claim **35**, Alexander discloses the limitation that the first terminal is a wireless terminal in phone 67 of Figure 1.

10. Claims **45 and 47** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,775,369 to McClung in view of U.S. Patent 5,577,110 to Aquino.

McClung discloses all the limitations of parent claims **1 and 3** as discussed in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) above.

McClung does not disclose expressly the limitation that accessing profile information comprises accessing speed dial information of the first terminal to establish the call session between the second and third terminals. Aquino discloses this limitation in lines 44-48 of column 1. McClung and Aquino are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of telephony services for a remote user. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify McClung to provide the roaming line with the same features as the user has when at home as the entire Aquino document teaches. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the customer the convenience of the same features on more terminals than his home terminal port as suggested in lines 21-44 of column 1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Aquino with McClung for the benefit of portable telephony features to obtain the invention as specified in claims 45 and 47.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert C. Scheibel whose telephone number is 571-272-3169. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday from 6:30-5:00 Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema S. Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2666

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ACS 10-24-05
Robert C. Scheibel
Examiner
Art Unit 2666

DT
DANG TON
PRIMARY EXAMINER